

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed March 24, 2005, has been carefully reviewed. The claims in the application are now claims 23, 24 and 26-51, and these claims define patentable subject matter not only under Sections 102 and 103, but also meet all the requirements of Section 112. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration and early formal allowance.

Acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicant's papers filed under Section 119 is noted.

No rejections have been imposed on the basis of any prior art, and applicant accordingly understands that applicant's claims (indeed **all** of applicant's claims) are deemed by the PTO to define novel and unobvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103.

Claims 25-28, 32-36, 38, 40, 44, 45 and 48-50 have only been objected to, i.e. these claims have not been rejected on any grounds whatsoever. Applicant accordingly understands that these claims are deemed by the PTO to not only define novel and unobvious subject matter, but also to meet all the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. Consequently, the deletion of some of these claims above is not to be taken as any

dedication, disclaimer, abandonment, waiver, forfeiture, renunciation, concession or surrender of any kind of the subject matter of such claims, as such subject matter of deleted claims is believed to be fully encompassed by the other claims which have not been deleted above.

Attached hereto is a proposed drawing correction for Fig. 5 in which the two stops 37 are distinguished by changing the reference designation 37 of the first stop to 37a, and the designation of the second stop 37 to 37b. Upon approval, a formal drawing will be presented. In addition, the specification will be appropriately amended to correspond with the changes proposed in Fig. 5.

Applicant respectfully requests approval to formally make these changes as proposed immediately above.

Claims 23 and 53 have been objected to because of certain informalities. The examiner's helpful suggestion has been adopted in claim 23. Claim 53 has been deleted, without prejudice as indicated above, as claim 53 is unnecessary and its subject matter is encompassed by other claims.

Claims 23, 24, 29-31, 37, 39, 41-43, 46, 47, 51 and 53 have been rejected under the second paragraph of Section 112. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Before addressing the rejection, applicant notes with appreciation the paragraph at the middle of page 4 of the Office Action which indicates that these claims are directed to "allowable" (patentable) subject matter, along with the claims which depend from claim 23. This is fully consistent with the absence of any rejections based on any prior art.

As regards the rejection based on Section 112, applicant believes that the claims as previously drafted, particularly when considered in light of applicant's specification (fully consistent with the law), would not have been confusing to those skilled in the art, and therefore the claims in their previous form are fully in accordance with Section 112. **At worst**, the claims rejected under the second paragraph of Section 112 in their previous form might be considered objectionable, but **only** as to form, requiring no substantial amendments relating to patentability.

Nevertheless, in deference to the examiner's views and to avoid needless argumentation, a number of cosmetic amendments have been made in some of the claims, including main claim 23¹. Such amendments are of a formal nature only, i.e. made to place the claims in improved form for U.S. practice. The amendments are not "narrowing" amendments

¹ Some reference numerals have been added in some claims, but these of course impose no limitations on the claims.

Appln. No. 09/830,698
Amdt. dated September 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 24, 2005


because the scope of the claims has not been reduced. No limitations have been added and none are intended; the meaning of the claims remain the same.

Applicant believes that the amendments presented above address all the points raised in the rejection, and applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicant believes that all issues raised in the Official Action have been addressed above in a manner that should lead to formal allowance of the present application. Accordingly, applicant again respectfully requests favorable consideration and early formal allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Sheridan Neimark

Registration No. 20,520

SN:jec/ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\bn\actj\fenger1\pto\AMD 26 sept 05.doc